Storytelling Diamond: An Antenarrative Integration of the Six Facets of Storytelling in Organization Research Design

Abstract

In the two decades since storytelling was called the "sensemaking currency of organizations," storytelling scholarship has employed a wide variety of research methods. The Storytelling Diamond model introduced here offers a map of this paradigmatic terrain based on wider social science ontology, epistemology, and methodological (both quantitative & qualitative) considerations. The model is beneficial for both researchers and reviewers as they plan for and assess the quality and defensibility of storytelling research designs. The main paradigms considered in the Storytelling Diamond model are narrativist, living story, materialist, interpretivist, abstractionist, and practice all as integrated by the antenarrative process.

Storytelling inquiry is especially rich as a vehicle to study processes and material conditions occurring inside the organization. Researchers have long held that storytelling plays a crucial role in creating and sustaining organizational identity, (Boje, 2001, 2008, 2011; Czarniawska, 1998; Gabriel, 2000; O'Connor, 2004; Weick, 2001). Storytelling research can bridge the gap between cause and effect (Gabriel, 2004), clarify strategic ambiguities (Barry & Elmes, 1997), create context infused with meaning and emotion (Shaw, Brown & Bromiley, 1998), and creatively communicate evidence and theory through "tools that merge the subjective and objective forms of data collection and analysis," (Dundon & Ryan, 2009, p. 569).

Our purpose is to provide specific paradigmatic guidance to those interested in designing storytelling research. How do you know whether one approach is better than others in storytelling research? What are the tradeoffs in choosing the approaches to storytelling in one paradigm over another?

A paradigm is defined here as: *the confluence of theory, method, and practice*, all of which are essential to properly designed storytelling research methods. We provide tables that help scholars identify the six facets of storytelling research design as integrated by antenarrative. In doing so we hope that scholars will be able to use our work in order to inform the design choices they make.

Essential to this paper, we include a discussion of the level of rigor, defensibility, and quality in terms of key features, benefits, limitations and the researcher's role and goal, as associated with the various paradigms' approaches to storytelling, as recommended by Esterby-Smith, Golden-Biddle, and Lock (2008) and Pratt (2008). It is particularly important to evaluate the proximity of the research to the life worlds of those being studied. Our article also offers specific guidelines for research design, to help scholars tell if one approach is more appropriate than another in various contexts. Our specific guidelines will also help researchers to evaluate storytelling paradigms, using the standards appropriate to each paradigm and understanding the various benefits and tradeoffs of each. Towards this end we will provide a checklist for reviewers of organizational storytelling research. In this way storytelling scholars will be able to assess the fit between research claims and paradigm standards.

In order to orient the reader, we must provide a working definition of what story telling means to us. Storytelling is defined as the intra-play of grand (master) narratives (epistemic or empiric) with living stories (their ontological webs of relations). Antenarratives make a process

connection between narratives and living stories. Here, storytelling is defined as the inclusive broader category and includes the opposition between narrative philosophies and living stories as well as certain antenarrative processes that some scholars suggest are operating in-between the storytelling paradigms. This definition of story allows for the study of elite narratives that permeate organizations as well as those that are hidden. It also includes the study of marginalized living stories, thus recognizing and giving voice to the voiceless. From the history of storytelling, we have developed the storytelling typologies and the Storytelling Diamond model. (Readers who wish to see the comprehensive narratology timeline can find it in Appendix A and B.)

In contemporary studies of storytelling in organizations, there is a presumed interplay between the centering and cohesive forces of petrified narrative (Czarniawska, 2004), and the more collective inclusive process of dialogic story (Boje, 2008; Gabriel, 2000). We have developed the storytelling typologies and the Storytelling Diamond model (see Figure 1) with the main incommensurable opposition between narrative and living story, which is based on Bakhtin's dialogic story. Living story also includes many indigenous scholars' approaches to reclaim story from westernized narrative.

Because of the frequent and disparate use of storytelling, we have conceptualized the Storytelling Diamond model as a meta-theoretical and methodological tool that allows for a deeper examination of storytelling inquiry. The main paradigms considered in the Storytelling Diamond model are narrativist, living story, materialist, abstractionists, practice, and antenarrativist, as depicted in Figure One. Our intent is that both seasoned and novice scholars use the model to ensure the quality, and substantiate the rigor, of storytelling inquiry. The Storytelling Diamond model makes a unique contribution as a tool that researchers can use to both understand storytelling and direct their storytelling research design. Our main theoretical advancement is that storytelling research may include both the deep western philosophic traditions of the organizational narrativist paradigm, and the more dialogic manner of the organizational living story paradigm as they interact across other major paradigms, through the process of antenarrative. Our contribution to the general methodological conversation is to continue to expand bi-paradigm studies (Romani, Primecz, & Topcu, 2011) by suggesting a multi-paradigm model of storytelling research which is composed of the six facets of the Storytelling Diamond model. Continued growth of this field may benefit from a map of this complex territory, and from using standards of rigor that are consistent with each paradigm.

To introduce the Storytelling Diamond model and its salience to storytelling research design, this paper proceeds as follows. We start by defining some of the key features of the six facets of storytelling research design as integrated by antenarrative. We look next at the key features, benefits, limitations and the researcher's role and goal as they relate to each paradigm. After discussing the Storytelling Diamond model, we look at a decision-making mechanism for researchers to consider when choosing among the storytelling paradigms. In order to help make this theoretical outline salient to the reader we present illustrations of various paradigms as integrated with, or expanded, by antenarrative. We show an example of two paradigms that are incommensurate but which some may find tempting to combine. We then show how the same research objectives can be met within a logically-consistent, but rarely used, paradigm combination. Finally, we propose an adaptation of Pratt's (2008) checklist for reviewers, applying it to the storytelling in organization research paradigms. The checklist highlights paths to defensibility, rigor, and quality in storytelling research. This is followed by guidelines for the researcher to use in creating this rigor and quality. We conclude with suggestions concerning the use of storytelling in organizational inquiry.

The Storytelling Diamond Typology

To create the Storytelling Diamond model of inter-related storytelling in organization paradigms, we adapted the ontological, epistemological and methodological dimensions suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1996, p. 108) to be narrative-specific. We include the more indigenous story work in qualitative research (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008). We added to these a practice facet.

These are our starting questions:

1. How can the storytelling inquirer find out from interviews, texts, or gestures whatever can be known? (*Methodology*)

2. What is the nature of Being-in-the-world, and what can be known through storytelling? (*Ontology*)

3. What is the nature of the relationship between storytelling and the inquirer assumptions about knowledge? (*Epistemology)*

4. How can the storytelling inquirer make a change in practice? *(Practices)*

Table 1 summarizes the researcher's key benefits and limitations that inform choices among organization storytelling paradigms: narrativist, living story, materialist, interpretivist, abstractionists, practice, and the antenarrativist process. Each is defined and explained below. The main paradigm incommensurability is between narrativist and living story.

Narrativist Paradigm. Narrativist consists of representative accounts of reality that are unique and generalizable. Fisher (1984, 1985a, b) describes people as *homo narrens,* yet his focus is on the rhetorical, the *probability* of the truthfulness of a tale through listening, and the *fidelity* to the listener's belief systems. According to Fisher, people also use *fidelity* to evaluate what they hear in narrative representations against their own experiences and their belief systems. Probability and fidelity demand a narrative rationality of making warrants to bridge grounds and claims. Fisher's narrative paradigm theory privileges rationality and coherence over living story emergence.

Like Fisher, Czarniawska (1997, p. 78) says, "A *story* consists of a plot comprising causally related episodes that culminate in a solution to a problem." In this narrativist paradigm, only certain kinds of stories are admissible: a story must be a "meaningful whole" (Czarniawska, 1999, p. 2), typically this whole represents a beginning, middle, and end (BME) structure. Weick's (1995) theory of narrative is about retrospective sensemaking of the past. Although Fisher, Czarniawska, and Weick privilege coherence, other researchers extend narrative theory to include a more emergent sense of story. Some researchers such as Gabriel (2000), on the other hand, view stories as more than narratives, since for them stories generate emotive response on the part of the audience.

Living Story. 'Living stories' are defined as having a material place Being-in-time and part of a collective story. Researchers disagree about how coherent and performative a story must be. Performative stories unfold in the moment and speak to their audiences in order to be relevant, contextualized, and inspirational (Gabriel, 2000). Researchers, such as Boje (2008, p. 331), on the other hand, suggests that "living story has many authors and as a collective force has a life of its own. We live in living stories." In other work by indigenous scholars (Smith, 1999), or Native American scholars, living stories have a time, place, and mind (Twotrees, 1997, 2007), and connect materially to the "life and process of the natural world" becoming vehicles for the transmission of culture (Cajete, 2000, p. 94). Whereas western narrative tends to have a beginning, middle, and end, indigenous stories often resist such linearity. For example, in

Navaho tribes a story can move in all four cardinal directions: "you start in the east, go south, then west, then north where the problem is finally resolved. Then you return to the east" (Henry Begay, as cited in Eder & Holyan 2010: 28). Finally, indigenous living story, as Vizenor (2008: 44,222,224) points out, has a materiality, a survivance of the collective, their material territorial sovereignty, the Native transmotion of these living stories, in an environment (place).

Our point is that, a restorying of the past dominant or grand narrative (Lyotard 1984) into a 'new story' of the anticipated future, can occur. Some paradigms are more closely aligned, as we shall explore, and in-between their more incommensurate nature, are antenarrative processes. The living story paradigm, by virtue of its non-linear and emergent qualities, offers a great deal of compatibility with practice paradigm's organizational change.

Materialist Paradigm. There are three approaches within the materialist paradigm: micro and macro history, neuropsychological, and post-humanism. In micro history work (microstoria), the focus is on calling into question the grand narratives of macrohistory by collecting 'little people's' stories. The charge against macrohistory by microstoria is that the former tells only the history of the politicians, business executives, military generals, and other major leaders (Boje 2001). Neuropsychological perspectives boil the material world down into brain processes by looking at things like how stories impact post traumatic stress disorder and the rise of the Arab spring (DARPA, 2011). Post-humanism is an attempt to move past the anthropocentric perspectives inherent in the linguistic turn and integrate historical materialism (Bennett 2009: 1).

Interpretivist Paradigm. Interpretivism is a particularly eclectic framework, combining interest in phenomenology, hermeneutical interpretation, interpretive anthropology, symbolic interactionism, and interpretative interactionism with radical and social constructivist thinking (Schwandt, 1996). Interpretivists, such as Geertz, Douglas and Devereux seek to unmask the hidden symbolism of stories, reading them as "depositories of meaning and expressions of deeper psychic, interpersonal, and social realities" (Gabriel, 2000, p. 15-16). Further, Jameson (1981: 36) provides a social symbolic sort of narrative interpretivist. Also familiar to many readers will be the historical hermeneutics of Max Weber (Bauman 1978: 69). The interpretivist paradigm once included social constructionist work by Berger, Luckmann, and Gergen. Gergen focuses more on the socially constructed aspects that are non-independently identifiable, while for Berger and Luckmann (1966), the social constructionists have forgotten the subjective origins of their construction, and their constructions are experienced as objective. In modern times,

though this, regretfully, has been transmuted into a much different perspective. Finally, and, quite interestingly, Ricoeur (1990) offers a temporal hermeneutics of narrative, an interpretivist perspective that allows for an integration of interesting historical perspectives.

Abstractionist Paradigm. The focus of the abstractionist paradigm is on substituting storytelling experience for abstract lables. Abstractionist inquiry is focused upon extracting elements from storytelling so that potentially generalizable facts and claims to truth can be revealed. It is usually an outsider who applies narrativist research the service of theory-building. Unfortunately, this practice has left interesting research questions that are not obtainable without participation outside of abstractionist research. Later, propose a turn in the definition of abstractionist that, through the antenarrative process, allows for both participant observation and a post-positivist scientific abstraction of what has been learned. At once, the trouble with our redefinition of abstractionist is that a transcendent/universalist perspective on such behaviors requires concessions that both objectivist and subjectivist researchers may find offensive, even if pragmatically and logically reasonable.

Practice Paradigm. Practice paradigm includes organizational change and development or more sociological praxis of ideological critique of institutions. Both involve action and reflection, identifying more entrenched strong organizational culture narratives as well as their living story resistance. Two approaches to practice (as change and development) are restorying and appreciative inquiry. White and Epston's (1990) restorying theory is a praxis for reconstructing individual and family stories; restorying has been applied to organizations (Rosile, 1998). Restorying involves externalizing the problem-saturated accounts in order to enable people to separate from their dominant narrative and construct a more desirable narrative (White & Epston, 1990, p. 41-48). There is praxis involves active deconstruction of the dominant narrative order that has control over the individual, group or organization. A second approach to practice is appreciative inquiry (AI), which seeks to supplement a more positive story, and discourages collection of negative stories. Appreciative inquiry focuses on the generative potential of positive images, which Cooperrider calls "anticipatory realities" (1990, p. 96). Both AI and restorying substitute more success-oriented stories for problem-ridden, entrenched, and static organizational narratives. The difference lies in AI's focus on positive language (discouraging deficit discourse) and collecting positive stories about the past and future as a change strategy, whereas restorying involves a deconstruction and critical inquiry into

dominating ideologies running through such narratives, cultivating marginalized points of lived story resistance (or exception), in order to create new stories.

Antenarrativist Paradigm. The antenarrative processes are in-between organizational storytelling main paradigms, in particular between narrativist and living story. Antenarratives are mostly in-between paradigms, and therefore represented by the arrows in Figure One. Antenarrative is a term with a double-meaning for "ante": *before* narrative cohesion sets in and *a bet* on shaping the future that is prospective-sensemaking (Boje, 2001). Antenarrative has four types of connection between the dominant narrative and living story: linear-, cyclic-, spiral-, and rhizomatic-antenarrative.

There has been increasing interest in the antenarrative paradigm, such as important work done with the initial formulations (Barge 2004; Collins & Rainwater, 2005; Durant, Gardner, Taylor, 2006; Vickers, 2005; Yolles, 2007) and most recently, Grow (2009); Vaara and Tienari (2011 *Organization Science*); and the new handbook: *Storytelling and the Future of Organizations: An Antenarrative Handbook* (Boje, 2011). Antenarrative is the process that stands between the incommensurable gaps between organizational storytelling main paradigms. This gap is defined as a parallax "confrontation of two closely linked perspectives between which no neutral common ground is possible" (Zizek, 2006: 4).

Applying the Storytelling Diamond Model

We turn now to a different set of paradigm questions integral to understanding storytelling in organization research that can lead to insight into how the researcher can uncover more philosophical science concerns with epistemology, ontology, and methododology.

1. What is the epistemological value of storytelling: is it a series of unique and generalizable accounts of reality, or is it a phenomenon that explains identity and rationality?
2. Does storytelling give a better understanding of an experienced truth of Being-in-the-world, or does it reflect a reinterpretation of lived experiences?
3. What methods motivate the researcher: is the goal finding empirical evidence (both qualitative & quantitiative) that leads to the testing hypotheses, or is it adding multiple perspectives so that a greater depth of understanding is possible? .

We will pause to sum up our main assumptions and model applications. One of the fundamental assumptions concerning the nature of research paradigms is that research questions, and thus outcomes, can vary substantially based on paradigm choices. Application of the Storytelling Diamond model, then, has value from two perspectives. First, the model highlights for readers and reviewers of research the implicit and explicit assumptions that a researcher has made when using storytelling inquiry and when reporting a study's findings. Second, the model situates the research question amongst the various paradigms with an eye toward capitalizing on the key benefits of research from that paradigm. Thus the Storytelling Diamond adds to the methodological toolbox of storytelling scholars and allows scholars to better appreciate differing methods that may stem from equally rigorous and consistent, though ontologically and epistemologically different, assumptions.

Next, we examine how researchers can choose among organizational storytelling paradigms. We begin with a research context in the left hand column. If the situation is one that is faced by the researcher, then the paradigm in the second column should be considered. The epistemology, ontology and methods indicated on the table should be considered when designing research. Keep in mind that, often, when conducting storytelling research the design is iterative. That is to say for example, if at some point during the research someone using a narrativist perspective finds out that a process understanding of the phenomenon is required, redesigning the research around the living story paradigm is not only possible, but essential.

Once the choices have been made, comparisons of epistemology should come first, using the antenarrative process to link any incommensurability between epistemologies. As a check against fundamentally illogical combinations, the ontological assumptions of these epistemological choices should be considered. Again, making compromises through the antenarrative process is highly recommended. Finally, a mixture of methods that best fit the research question should be used. When doing this be careful not to dismiss the potential for quantifying qualitative research and gaining a deeper qualitative understanding of any quantitative data that may have been mined from the stories. Greater detail on the exact nature of the antenarrative process can be found in the antenarrative handbook (Boje 2011).

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Table 2 summarizes, in the first column, some of the main considerations in choosing among storytelling paradigms. Then the last three columns look at issues of epistemology, ontology, and method. The intention is to show some places where the epistemology and ontology overlap or is predominantly are separated, and places where particular methods are chosen more often. We allow for multiple assumptions to be held at once. Also, do not categorize particular paradigms as purely ontological or epistemological, as many questions may benefit from a poly-vocal perspective. In the next section we look at some work that is crossing paradigms in unique ways.

Applying the model - To see if our Storytelling Diamond model is useful in understanding published research, we selected a variety of journal articles that use as many differing approaches to living story and narrative as possible. We also wanted to cross disciplinary lines: i.e. we did not focus exclusively on "management" journals or scholars. To identify the narrative inquirers' uses of storytelling as described by our model, we evaluate the arguments that the scholars postulate regarding the value of story in organizational research. We first identify major and minor premises and conclusions regarding the value of story in organizational research. Next, we ask if these premises and conclusions concern ontology, epistemology, or methodological aspects of story. We end our analysis with a conclusion regarding the researcher's use of story: Is it primarily surface level action in the organization, deep structure, or a combination?   Using the Storytelling Diamond model, we discern clearly differentiated paradigms that represent alternative worldviews and basic beliefs about the narrated nature of the world (ontology), narrative knowledge (epistemology), and narrative inquiry (methodology). The following paragraphs provide examples from these paradigms.

Abstractionist Narrativist. For the positivist, an appropriate method in storytelling inquiry is an abstractionist perspective of a narrativist epistemology. This style of inquiry is best used within low dynamical environments by a researcher attempting to generalize across environments of equally low dynamics. The researcher constructs scales that can then be used across phenomenon with theoretically similar contextual variables. For example, in studying organizational change, Heracleous and Barrett (2001) build an abstractionist discourse analysis methodology based on a narrativist epistemology. These authors conclude that narrative has consistent structural properties that point to underlying reasons for the success or failure of a change effort.

10

> Our strategy was to interview, within each organization, both individuals who actively used the system and those who did not, so as to compare and contrast their interpretations of key systems features (p. 760)….Our analysis supports a view of organizations as constituted of fragmented, competing, and less often, complementary discourses (p.773-774)….such conflicting discourses can attain the status of system contradictions…that have highly adverse effects on the implementation of system wide change processes. (p.774)

This epistemology informs a methodological intent to abstract what has been found. For example, Heracleous and Barrett (2001) also write:

> We focused on the stakeholder-group level of analysis, exploring the discourses of different stakeholder groups and how they interacted. We focused, in addition, on the market level of analysis in terms of change actions and outcomes. Analysis at these levels presupposed the collection of ethnographic data based on in-depth interviews and observation of individual actors. In this sense, data collection encompassed the individual level, so that we could draw valid inferences at higher levels of analysis.

Contrast Heracleous and Barrett (2001) with Jabri's 1997 materialist study of organizational change. Jabri (1997, p. 28) builds an abstractionist, narrativist discourse, concluding that discourse itself is inadequate when studying change:

> Theorizing on change is not past in an objective sense; it is a past that is continually brought forward—often shown and re-remembered through pictures and images. Our memories of the pace of change, restructuring and other episodes (pictures) are a significant part of the myth by which we communicate our experience of change.

Jabri assumes that narratives reflect the reality of multiple levels. The informant is a tool for obtaining narratives, which are tested against the objectivity of key system features. This method of assessing the veracity and generalizability of a narrative is strongly recommended for a study of the managerial implications of the narrative.

Both examples (Heracleous and Barrett 2001; Jabri 1997) illustrate abstractionist, multi-level storytelling inquiry, but the conclusions drawn from studying multiple levels vary greatly. Heracleous and Barrett (2001) contend that studying multiple discourses can uncover significant elements affecting change. By exploring discourses from differing stakeholder groups, they build a number of linear cumulative accounts that help reflect the underlying narrative of interest. Heracleous and Barrett (2001) assume that informants' information reflect the truth of the narratives of interest. After combining the narratives, Heracleous and Barrett (2001) reject a null-hypothesis regarding the similarity of groups on differing levels and stakeholder contexts. But

when employing a materialistic perspective, Jabri (1997, p. 26) offers a different picture of change: "There are indeed issues in change that cannot be put into words."

While the abstractionist perspective is popular among researchers, a praxis perspective may be useful when theory regarding substantive contextual elements has not been properly built. Simply put, a researcher who upholds the abstractionist assumptions of synthesizability and generalizability might fail to see dynamic differences among situations. A way to expand the researcher's abstractionist approach is to add a praxis-based methodology to the researcher's narrativist epistemology.

Practice Narrativist. The praxis methodology with narrativist epistemological assumptions offers a useful extension to the abstractionist view. Further, it is a rigorous and consistent research methodology when used on its own. Offering a stark contrast to the assumption of the objective observer in pure positivist science, the praxis approach adds depth instead of complexity. A praxis perspective is apparent in the work of Gabriel (1995):

> The workers, it is argued, may submit to management's cultural assaults but they also resist them, by developing their own sub-cultures and counter-cultures. These may challenge or ridicule the organization's shibboleths, expressing cynicism and detachment at managerial attempts to whip up commitment and enthusiasm… In this paper I will argue that both debates have tended to adopt an over-managed and over-policed image of organizations, an image which both politically and symbolically the individual is over-control and over-socialized, his or her options being essential to submit or to rebel. (p. 482)

Practice Materialist - We contrast Gabriel's perspectives with those of Dunford and Jones (2000), who adopt a materialist ontology in studying the same phenomenon. Dunford and Jones (2000, p. 1208) conclude that the role of managers in any change process "involves the constituting of a new reality in the minds of organizational members."

> At times of change, organizational members will construct an interpretation of events and of the implications for them (sensemaking). The senior management of an organization cannot prevent this process occurring, but they can seek to have a major influence on the interpretations that are arrived at by presenting their own construction of events (sensemaking).

The praxis perspective encourages multiple voices. Yet the way in which the voices are heard varies greatly from encouragement (Gabriel) to silencing (Dunford and Jones). Praxis assumes that the data-tool, that is the narrator, has changed the narrative in a way that is useful for the individual and moves past the simple linear reflection of reality of the abstractionist. Praxis looks

at the identity and rationality that are created by manner of speech. Further, the quotes from Dunford and Jones (2000) reflect a motivation for a solution to the detachment and cynicism that are prevalent in taking a purely managerial approach in organizational science.

Practice Antenarrativist. The influence of the antenarrativist epistemology on methodology is one that has been orthogonal to the assumptions of the abstractionist method. While the antenarrativist epistemological assumption is focused on goals related to the creation of an identity for repressed minority groups, the abstractionist tries to mitigate such contextual differences in an attempt to find a generalizable process. The antenarrativist crisscrossing between ontology and epistemology (see Table 2), while creating frame-breaking research, has also been primarily limited to a praxis perspective and, thus, has been more palatable to the positivist mind.

Materialist Antenarrative - An exemplar of antenarrative research that utilizes a materialist ontology can be found in the Mills, Boylstein and Lorean (2001, p.124) paper on organizational culture in the Saturn Corporation. They conclude that organizational storytelling acts to silence and marginalize workers.

> The link between organization and a sense of community, affiliation and the development of 'team player identity' is communication, or more specifically for this analysis, storytelling. Through storytelling, metaphors arise and the individual and organization develop shared meanings of what 'community', 'affiliation' and 'team membership' encompass. However, as stated, this style of meta-narrative is oppressive and tends to silence various voices that do not adapt their communicative behaviours to the constructed 'team player' discourse.

The interpretivist perspective on the phenomenon of organizational culture and the role that storytelling plays is clearly different as demonstrated by Humphreys and Brown (2002, p. 421):

> It is suggested that identity, both individual and collective, and the processes of identification which bind people to organizations, are constituted in the personal and shared narratives that people author in their efforts to make sense of their world and read meaning into their lives.

What is the difference in praxis methodology under an antenarrative working in-between epistemological and ontological assumptions? The difference comes in the integration of a sensemaking epistemology that underlies a meta-narrative and whether that integration is supportive or oppressive conditions of 'Being.' Further, the teller of the living stories is assumed not to be reflecting an overarching truth, but rather an essence of self that is embodied in the

recreation of stories for personal use. With the antenarrative motivation having been changed from the service of management to the service of the disenfranchised (a change in praxis), the multiple perspectives create a deeper understanding. In stark contrast to the positivist perspective, the antenarrative scholar is an agent for disenfranchised voices. These voices are heard in the above quote and in their implied resistance to assumed molds. The active motivation for the desired outcome of resolving conflicts hovers around the intention to redistribute power to those who have now been given voices. We would also like to offer an example of an interaction that simply does not work.

Narrativist Living Story - To see an illustration of a combination that does not work consider the storytelling diamond model and the juxtaposition between Narrativist and Living Story. In table 2 we see that the methodological assumptions of the narrativist paradigm are incommensurate with the desires of Living Story. Narrativist want to find the underlying reality of the situation and thus keep themselves from interfering with the storytelling that they are observing. Living Story assumes that this is an impossibility, as any level of interaction with the ongoing storytelling process, even just having the story repeated, is itself a part of the process. Further, living story methods require that a deep-experiential understanding of the situation take place, as the depth of meaning of lived stories only becomes salient when the experiential context is part of the experiences of the researcher.

It is a logical impossibility to design research where in the organizational scholar is both constantly distance and participatingly observant. Attempting this is a major, and common, mistake made by researchers that come from a post-positivist perspective. When the need for deep understanding becomes obvious, new storytelling scholars may-still try to *say* they are using grounded theory in a way that matches the assumptions of post-positivism. In fact, it seems reviewers often expect this sort of paradoxical perspective, an expectation that defies logic. What follows is a rarely used which combination is logically feasible and also gets at the sort of understanding that the narrativist living-story is trying to obtain.

Abstractionist Living Story – The antenarrative process works between quantitative & qualitative and between epistemology and ontology. By using an antenarrative perspective, the link between living story (the necessary method for many research questions) and abstractionist (the epistemological home for many western scholars) can be brought together. The first step here is to accept that the living stories of one group may be something that helps in

understanding another group, an antenarrative concession from the anthropological camp. The second step is to accept that being part of the process is essential to understanding and offers better knowledge than keeping clinical distance, an antenarrative concession from the post-positivist camp.

If there are questions that can only be understood emic-ly, such as a deep description of process that must be experienced to be understood, then research should be designed around living story. If the audience with whom the scholar wishes to converse is in need of abstractions in order to value the findings, then the deep descriptions of living story should be turned into abstracted categories. It is through a tracing of the potential in-between singular narratives and the living stories that antenarrative can link the potential abstractions with the lived experiences. This sort of research will go beyond the monologist categorizations of most abstractionist responses while still providing the usable, but now contextually valid and logically consistent, categorizations that appeal to the scientific assumptions of those in the US. This might look like the abstraction-categories that we see in grounded In our final section, we propose some ways a checklist for reviewers can identify and assess organizational storytelling paradigms.

Situating the Research—Guidelines for the Reviewer

Based on this in-depth approach to understanding storytelling research, a natural question emerges: On what basis will submissions based on storytelling research be adjudicated in the review process? [1] Do reviewers apply to storytelling research the same criteria as applied to other qualitative research? As Easterby-Smith, Golden-Biddle, and Locke (2008, p. 423) point out, reviewers and editors must be "informed as to how articles ought to be shaped and judged relative to the traditions from which they emanate." Our Storytelling Diamond provides that guidance to reviewers so that they can review storytelling research outside of the traditions within which the reviewers might operate, applying criteria consistent with the ontological, epistemological, and methodological traditions of storytelling research.

The criteria used to judge storytelling research are akin to the criteria to judge ethnography, as provided by Denzin (1997) who distinguishes analytic and storied approaches. Similarly, we

---

[1] Our questions echo that of Easterby-Smith, Golden-Biddle, and Locke (2008, p. 419).

distinguish etic and emic approaches to storytelling. An etic approach is abstractionist and based upon congruence with existing theory as well as ability to add to the theoretical base. Etic research is incremental and values repeatability; it intends to grow a twig on a branch of a much larger tree. Emic research is oriented to praxis and based upon congruence with lived experience and the ability to engage the imagination. Emic research wants a new tree; it values novelty over repeatability. Although the etic researcher is a neutral observer, the emic researcher is an involved participant. In terms of storytelling research, the etic researcher is a narrativist, and the emic researcher is an *antenarrativist.*

Based on this in-depth approach to understanding storytelling research, a natural question emerges: On what basis will submissions based on storytelling research be adjudicated in the review process? [1] Do reviewers apply to storytelling research the same criteria as applied to other qualitative research? As Easterby-Smith, Golden-Biddle, and Locke (2008, p. 423) point out, reviewers and editors must be "informed as to how articles ought to be shaped and judged relative to the traditions from which they emanate." Our Storytelling Diamond provides that guidance to reviewers so that they can review storytelling research outside of the traditions within which the reviewers might operate, applying criteria consistent with the ontological, epistemological, and methodological traditions of storytelling research.

The criteria used to judge storytelling research are akin to the criteria to judge ethnography, as provided by Denzin (1997) who distinguishes analytic and storied approaches. Similarly, we distinguish etic and emic approaches to storytelling. An etic approach is abstractionist and based upon congruence with existing theory as well as ability to add to the theoretical base. Etic research is incremental and values repeatability; it intends to grow a twig on a branch of a much larger tree.

A Checklist for Reviewers How does the Storytelling Diamond provide guidance to reviewers? Table 3 gives some guidelines for assessing rigor in the various storytelling paradigms. Pratt (2008) points to a lack of "boilerplate" for evaluating qualitative research (p. 489): i.e., a lack of "standard operating procedures for evaluating qualitative work" (p. 489). Pratt suggests the creation of "checklists" that "point out what elements need to be part of a Method section" (p. 502). According to Pratt, the elements can be "viewed as a series of four nested questions" (p. 502): (1) "Why this study?" (2) "Why study here?" (3) "What am I studying and why?" (4) "How did I study these things?"   Thus, although a storytelling

16

boilerplate or template may not be possible, researchers should address these four questions, and reviewers should be able to identify the answers to these questions in storytelling research. We start the checklist with an overview of the questions asked in table 3. Our checklist, which follows Pratt's outline, for choosing among the organizational storytelling paradigms found in Table 3.

Situating the Research—Guidelines for the Researcher

Just as with other forms of qualitative research, storytelling research draws from and is shaped by different theoretical paradigms. Successful execution of this research requires a systematic, detailed and nuanced approach that results in well-supported research claims. The storytelling model helps a researcher create robust, rigorous storytelling research, through a multi-element iterative process that matches ontological and epistemological assumptions with appropriate methods. Table 3 summarizes the characteristics of the six paradigms that constitute the Storytelling Diamond model, such that .

<div align="center">INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT</div>

From a researcher's perspective, the first major step in situating storytelling research is identifying ontological assumptions—the underlying belief structure of the researcher regarding the nature of being and the essential properties of the human experience. In storytelling research, the question is one of the nature of story and whether it is seen as a reflection of reality (materialist) or as constituting reality (interpretivist). This dimension is in many ways static, because while a researcher's ontological perspective may evolve over time, it is what it is. Thus this step is one of acknowledgement of the existing ontology, not one of creating or choosing an ontology.

The second step in situating the research regards its goal: Does the researcher intend to uncover existing reality through story (abstractionist) or change the dominant reality (praxis)? Abstractionists prefer pre-defined categories of stories, such as morality tales or personal success stories, while praxis-oriented researchers prefer to collect stories "in situ" which more closely resembles lived experience, which is especially critical when, for instance, the researcher is attempting to compare high- and low-context cultures.

Finally, there is a decision-point regarding methodology and how the researcher intends to use data that is collected from stories. The first category is the more traditional narrativist

approach to storytelling wherein data are collected, organized, and interpreted based on established theory and proven categorization. This is a "researcher as observer" perspective on data collection. The second possibility is an antenarrative approach that collects stories as they are being played out in lived experience without regard for whether these stories are yet complete.

While the eight paths depicted in the storytelling model are theoretically possible, some combinations are more "natural" fits than others because characteristics of each paradigm can pose theoretical dilemmas. For instance, since narrativist researchers typically prefer "etic" methods, existing narratives are the empirical evidence used to test hypotheses. Sense-making is retrospective as individuals reflect on these existing narratives. Thus narrativist researchers are typically abstractionist-oriented. Narrativists also tend to be interpretivists, in part because they assume that the world is knowable through structured and identifiable narratives that are interpreted within existing theoretical frameworks. These narratives form the basis for social and historical processes of meaning making.

A significant drawback to narrativist research concerns the lack of consistent definitions for phenomenon studied across contexts. For instance, personal success may be defined very differently in individualist versus collectivist cultures, leading to misinterpretations of stories. Narrativist approaches, if used at all in emic research, must be used with great care taken to validate the externally-imposed categories within the specific cultural context.

This approach may use deconstruction or other analytic methods to reveal the way lived experience becomes "living story" and then may be transformed into narrative. The antenarrativist perspective allows for the study of the same phenomenon across different contexts, especially when the phenomenon is experienced very differently. For example, indigenous storytelling and euro-western storytelling can be studied simultaneously, even though the two are very different. Similarly, high-context cultures and "strong" cultures that may have more terse and cryptic narratives than other cultures can also be studied successfully with the different archetypal "antenarrative" formats such as linear, cyclical, spiral, or rhizomatic assemblage patterns.

A major challenge with antenarrative research is the difficulty in generalizing findings to other contexts. Another danger exists if the dominant narratives are not deconstructed because

their material conditions may be overlooked. Such an oversight might constrain possibilities for change in those same material conditions.

In Conclusion

As we began this study, the one question that arose repeatedly was: How can scholars benefit from clarity in storytelling paradigms or from just knowing that distinctive paradigms exist? We've concluded that benefits accrue in two ways. The first is in richer research designs and the second is in wider acceptance of storytelling paradigms as vigorous, creative, defensible scholarship.

The richness of a research design can be enhanced in two ways. First, the Storytelling Diamond model can be used to decide what methodology is most appropriate for the research goals. Second, the model can be used to help extend existing research by providing additional perspectives by which to study the use of story and storytelling inquiry in organization inquiry.

One of the advantages of storytelling inquiry is that it is useful at both the theoretical and applied levels. For instance, assume that a researcher is interested in understanding why different actors are telling very different stories about an organizational event. From a theoretical perspective, storytelling inquiry can be used to add context to the stories thereby giving them meaning and helping to interpret those stories. Stories can be collected, analyzed, and categorized to provide a clearer picture of the differences underlying the varying versions of the event.

At the applied level, again assume that a researcher is searching for managerial tools that work in a given organization situation. Storytelling inquiry can help identify the conditions and processes that are most effective. In fact, this approach to storytelling inquiry allows for a multitude of research designs. Scholars may conduct field studies, collecting data via observation or interview. Alternatively, the research may create an experimental design, thereby testing the viability of a range of tools in multiple situations. By using the Storytelling Diamond model, the researcher has the flexibility to create a unique research design while maintaining precise and rigorous standards that are necessary in organization science.

Extending existing studies is another benefit of using the Storytelling Diamond model. Typically, scholars adopt a consistent perspective when choosing research designs. Choices are made regarding ontology, epistemology, and methodology. One wonders what would happen,

19

for instance, if scholars who previously adopted a particular perspective chose to extend their scholarship by seeing what else could be learned with a different lens. We are not suggesting that the scholar should have used a different lens, only that the knowledge gained could be extended with multiple perspectives. For instance, because of the nature of an interpretivist lens, the scholar assumes that narrative is socially constructed and gives equal weight to stories from any and all subjects. Thus the findings are predicated on the assumption that all stories are created equally. But what happens if the scholars choose to extend their research by adopting a materialist lens and ask the question: Are some of these stories privileged over others? Are some of the stories actually elite narratives that have greater influence in the construction of the objective reality? How do their results change when some narratives are privileged over others? Again, it is not our intention to claim that the scholars should have used a different lens, only that the richness of their study can potentially be enhanced through multiple lenses.

We do suggest that the richness of organization science overall can be enhanced with the rigorous use of storytelling inquiry. The application of the Storytelling Diamond model provides an interesting window into our acceptance and use of story and storytelling inquiry as a viable approach to organizational research. The model helps us assess the objective reality of storytelling as a qualitative methodology and asks the question: Does a storytelling methodology adhere to sufficient rigor to meet scientific standards? We suggest that it can, as long as the assumptions inherent in the research are clearly articulated and understood by both the scholars who create the research and those who use it to further our understanding of organizations and human interaction. We hope that the Storytelling Diamond model can help explain why there is value in research methods that reject generalizable conceptualizations in favor of deep description, thereby giving voice to previously disenfranchised methodologies.

Practice is not a unitary concept. Practices, in organizational development and change, are not the same practices as praxis in sociology or Marxist ideological critique. Nor are they the practices familiar to positivist or post-positivistic methods, such as survey research feedback done to change practices. Instead, practice is the fundamental outcomes desired by the research design. Despite the interested-party nature of practice, post-positivism often hides its move toward practical change in the organization being studied under a thin veneer of pragmatism.

Finally, researchers who are looking at ways of extending organizational inquiry through more expansive narrative might be interested in quantum storytelling and the role that living

story plays in it. "Living story" has the potential to open a new door into interpreting narrative not as a coherent, linear account of events but as a living entity itself.

In creating the storytelling diamond we suggest that researchers have more options than previously believed when using story and storytelling in their studies. Further, we help clarify research design so that both implicit and explicit assumptions about narrative are more clearly defined and understood within storytelling inquiry. Our goal has been to offer a guide to the expanding field of storytelling inquiry while increasing rigor and quality in storytelling research designs.

REFERENCES